

**Minutes of the Regular Planning Board Meeting
Monday, June 11, 2007**

1. CONVENE: 7:12 p.m.
2. FLAG SALUTE: Board member Cunningham
3. ROLL CALL: President Lynch, Vice President Cook, Cunningham, Ezzy Ashcraft, and Kohlstrand.

Board members Mariani and McNamara were absent from roll call.

Also present were Planning Services Manager Andrew Thomas, Assistant City Attorney Donna Mooney, Supervising Planner Doug Garrison, Planner III Doug Vu.

4. MINUTES:
 - a. Minutes for the Special meeting of May 29, 2007.

Mr. Thomas advised that the minutes for the Special meeting of May 29, 2007, would be considered at the meeting of June 25, 2007.

5. AGENDA CHANGES AND DISCUSSION:

President Lynch noted that with respect to Item 8-B, the Board would like to ensure that the applicant was responding to the open items at the desire of the Planning Board. He would like to clarify those items for the record.

Board member Cunningham noted that the resolution detailed those items.

Mr. Thomas suggested that the item be pulled from the Consent Calendar, and discuss the item with the applicant without taking action.

Board member Cunningham would like to follow normal procedure of hearing the staff report, analyzing the plans and review it as any other application.

Board member Kohlstrand noted that the item was advertised as a continued item, and did not feel it would be appropriate to pull it off the Consent Calendar.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that it had originally been continued to this meeting, and inquired why it was continued. Mr. Thomas replied that there had since been a Call for Review on the environmental documentation, which went to City Council on June 5. on June 6, the Planning packet went out. He noted that there was a communication problem between staff and the applicants in that they were under the impression they could return with just the revised site plan. Staff believed the Board would need a full set

of design review plans, and the applicants did not realize that until too late. Therefore, staff recommended a continuance to give them time to produce those plans, and give staff time to review them in order to provide a full staff report. He noted that the notation on the agenda stating that the item had been continued to June 25 was written as if that continuation had already occurred, when in fact staff made the recommendation for the Board to continue it. He noted that in the future, staff should not take that option away from the Board.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft moved to remove Item 8-B from the Consent Calendar to the Regular Agenda.

Board member Cunningham seconded the motion, which carried by the following voice vote – 5. Absent: 2 (Mariani, McNamara).

6. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

a. Future Agendas

Mr. Thomas provided an update on future agenda items.

Ms. Mooney noted that for future reference, a motion to remove an item from the Consent Calendar was not necessary, and that any one Board member may have it removed.

7. ORAL COMMUNICATION:

Ms. Susan Battaglia noted that she recently had a discussion about Target, and inquired whether it would be placed on the agenda in the near future.

Mr. Thomas advised that the application was still active, and that staff has released the DEIR. He noted that many comments had been received on the DEIR, and added that staff was still in the process of preparing response and doing additional analysis to respond to the comments. Staff hoped to have it ready and circulated for public review in August. The next step would be to return to the Planning Board tentatively on August 13, 2007, for the Planning Board's review of that project.

President Lynch noted that there had not yet been a decision made with respect to Target.

In response to an inquiry by Board member Kohlstrand regarding the public comment period for the DEIR, Mr. Thomas confirmed that it had closed, and that staff was in the process of responding to those comments. He added that there will be public hearings before the Planning Board on the project.

8. CONSENT CALENDAR:

8-A. **Annual Status Report on Implementation of the General Plan.**

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that page 2 of the Report on the Status of the General Plan, regarding the Climate Protection Task Force implemented in 2006, the last sentence read, “The local action plan will *possibly* create new policies to be incorporated into the City’s General Plan, as well as implement climate and air quality policies related to drought-resistant landscaping ...” She noted that when she tried to get commitments regarding the implementation of green building ordinances in the City, she often heard the Climate Protection Task Force would address that. She believed the language was too fuzzy for her liking, and inquired why it was not more definite.

Mr. Thomas noted that staff intended to say that the local action plan that the Task Force products will go directly to City Council, and the Council will then establish priorities for implementing the programs within that plan. He noted that may not entail adopting policies in the General Plan, and that there may be existing General Plan policies that would enable the City to directly establish a Green Building Ordinance. He noted that this report went directly to the State, and through this process, the City may identify additional policies that should be implemented at the General Plan level to provide the foundation for future sustainability ordinances or programs.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that Item 7 on the table on page 2 (Action Plan: Rehabilitation and Neighborhood Preservation) addressed the amnesty plan for undocumented units, and inquired how that process worked. Mr. Thomas briefly described the amnesty program, and noted that undocumented units discovered through Code Enforcement may go through a process of legalizing those units.

Vice President Cook moved to adopt the Annual Status Report on Implementation of the General Plan.

Board member Cunningham seconded the motion, which carried by the following voice vote – 5. Absent: 2 (Mariani, McNamara).

8-B. **UP07-0002 – S. Fong – 2601 Blanding Avenue #B.** The applicant requests approval of a Use Permit pursuant to Section 30-10.6. of the Alameda Municipal Code to install five additional game machines at the existing Play N Trade store. The applicant also requests to hold promotional gaming events once per month. Play N Trade is located within the Bridgeside Shopping Center in the C-2-PD (Central Business District/Planning Development Combining) Zoning District.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft moved to remove Item 8-B from the Consent Calendar to the Regular Agenda.

Board member Cunningham seconded the motion, which carried by the following voice vote – 5. Absent: 2 (Mariani, McNamara).

Mr. Vu presented the staff report, and recommended approval of this item.

The public hearing was opened.

There were no speakers.

The public hearing was closed for Board discussion.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft disclosed that she visited the applicant's business earlier in the evening, and complimented the applicant on a beautiful space that was very nicely done. She noted that all eight of the video gaming stations were already installed. She was concerned about the lack of discussion about how the adjacent businesses in the Center would be impacted by the tournaments, although they would be held on early Sunday evenings. She inquired how the condition requiring participants to not loiter after the conclusion of the event would be enforced. She noted that the language read, "If the applicant fails to comply with this requirement, the Planning Director *may* require the applicant to hire additional security to ensure compliance." She would like that language to be strengthened to read, "...the Planning Director *shall* require the applicant to hire additional security to ensure compliance." She did not want the initial responsibility to fall on the Alameda Police Department.

Mr. Vu advised that staff contacted the adjacent store owners, who did not express any initial concerns. Staff had hoped that the shopping center would in essence police itself.

President Lynch noted that in the Code Enforcement area, it was very problematic to address the "shalls" in a practical manner. He discussed the enforcement process within Alameda, and noted that the language meant different things to staff and the enforcement agencies as opposed to how the word "shall" is used in a design review.

Board member Kohlstrand noted that she felt comfortable leaving some flexibility for the staff in the language at this time.

Mr. Thomas noted that if any problems should arise at the site, he believed that staff would hear about it very quickly. He noted that the word “may” could be changed to “shall,” or remain the same, with the option of review by the Board if the conditions were not being followed. He added that the option of use permit revocation would also be a possibility if necessary.

Ms. Mooney noted that the Board had a number of wording options, including adding the phrase “take equivalent measures.”

Board member Cunningham moved to adopt Planning Board Resolution No. PB-07-21 to approve a Use Permit pursuant to Section 30-10.6. of the Alameda Municipal Code to install five additional game machines at the existing Play N Trade store. The applicant also requests to hold promotional gaming events once per month.

Board member Kohlstrand seconded the motion, which carried by the following voice vote – 4. Abstain: 1 (Ezzy Ashcraft) Absent: 2 (Mariani, McNamara).

- 8-C. **Initial Study IS05-0001; Planned Development Amendment PDA05-0001; Major Design Review DR05-0010; Use Permits UP06-0003, UP06-0010, UP06-012 and UP06-0013; - Applicant: Safeway, Inc. 2234 Otis Drive (adjacent Alameda Towne Centre) (DG).** The applicant requests approval of Planned Development Amendment, Major Design Review and Use Permits allowing the demolition of an existing bank building and redevelopment of the property with a gas station. The project includes three covered pump islands, each containing three pumps, for a total of eighteen pumping stations. Fuel will be stored in the 20,000-gallon underground storage tanks. In addition to the approximately 7,500-square-foot canopy covering the gasoline pumping facilities, the project includes an approximately 625-square-foot building, housing the cashier's desk, restrooms and retail sales of convenience items. The applicant is proposed twenty-four-hour operations and the sale of beer and wine. An Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared for this project. Mitigation measures have been identified that will reduce potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level. The site is located within a Central Business District with Planned Development overlay Zoning District (C-2-PD). **(Continued to the meeting of June 25, 2007.)**

Vice President Cook moved to continue this item to the next Planning Board meeting.

Board member Cunningham seconded the motion, which carried by the following voice vote – 5. Absent: 2 (Mariani, McNamara).

9. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS:

- 9-A. **UP06-0010 – N. Saidian & L. Zekster – 1310 Central Avenue.** The applicant requests approval of a Use Permit pursuant to Section 30-30.2 of the Alameda Municipal Code to extend the hours of operation for the Alameda Valero Gasoline Station, an existing legal nonconforming service station. The current hours of operation for fuel service and auto repair are 9:00 a.m.-6:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, 9:00 a.m.-4:00 p.m. on Saturday, and closed on Sunday. The proposed hours for fuel service and auto repair would be 7:00 a.m.-8:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, 9:00 a.m.-4:00 p.m. on Saturday, and closed on Sunday. The auto repair hours would be eliminated on Saturday. The Alameda Valero Gasoline Station is located in the R-4 (Neighborhood Residential) Zoning District.

Mr. Vu summarized the staff report, and detailed the background and scope of this proposed project. Staff was unable to make the findings necessary, as required by the Municipal Code, in order to recommend approval of this Use Permit. Staff specifically found that the proposed use was not compatible with the other land uses in the area, that it will adversely effect other property in the vicinity, and that it does not relate favorably to the City's General Plan. Therefore, it was staff's recommendation that the Board deny the use permit application to extend the fuel service hours of operation in exchange for the reduced auto repair hours, based upon the findings that were included in the staff report.

President Lynch advised that more than five speaker slips had been received.

Board member Cunningham moved to reduce the speakers' time to three minutes.

Vice President Cook seconded the motion, which carried by the following voice vote – 5. Absent: 2 (Mariani, McNamara).

The public hearing was opened.

Mr. Eric Scheuerman spoke in support of this project, and noted that the staff report stated the gas station had been in place since 1950, and recalled a newspaper report stated it had been there in some form since 1926. He believed the gas station was a historical business at this location, and added that it was changed to a nonconforming use in 1974 because the owners wanted to have a 24-hour gas-food operation. He did not want the opposition to drive the owners out of business. He agreed that some businesses should be closed on Sundays.

Mr. Philip Gravem, 1344 Sherman Street, spoke in opposition to this project and noted that he lived directly across from the station. He noted that the 1974-75 issue addressed a second gas station across the street that wanted a 24-hour food operation. He complimented the owner and said the station was much better than it had been before. He expressed concern about the station's impact on his family time during the evening hours, and did not want the hours to be extended.

President Lynch noted that Mr. Gravem had been his vice principal and civics teacher at St. Joseph's High School.

Ms. Susan Battaglia spoke in favor of extending the hours for the gas station, and did not like going in the opposite direction to Webster Street in heavy traffic to get gas. She noted that the other stations frequently had higher prices. She noted the traffic flow at the gas station was uncomplicated, and distributed a petition with 60 signatures in support of the extended hours. She believed that operating hours from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m. was reasonable, and did not believe that this use would interfere with family time in the evenings. She would rather have the sales tax dollars from Alameda gas stations to remain on the island, and was concerned that leakage was occurring because of gas sales outside the station's current operating hours. She believed the extended hours would benefit the consumers, the owners and the City.

Mr. Randall Miller, 1406 Central Avenue, noted that the goal of all the owners since the gas station opened was to have extended hours. He was concerned that if this use permit were to be granted, that other requests would be made, up to and including 24-hour operation. He urged the Planning Board to follow the staff's recommendation of not expanding the hours.

Mr. Craig Coombs noted that he lived two blocks from the site, and while he was affected by the traffic, he spoke in favor of the expansion of the hours. He noted that this station had been in operation in some form since 1928, and believed there was a community need to a business that can sustain itself for 80 years. He noted that there was a tradition of service and community for this gas station, and that he hoped that would be maintained. He noted that the neighbors who wanted to buy gas had to drive through the island to another gas station, which increased congestion and pollution.

Ms. Patricia Kinsel, 1307 Central Avenue, noted that she lived directly across from the gas station, and expressed concern about the safety of the schoolchildren crossing Encinal if the station were to be open at that time.

Mr. Myan, 1311 Central Avenue, spoke in opposition to the extended hours, and expressed concern about safety of the schoolchildren, as well as quality of life.

Mr. Robert Drake, 1105 Sherman Street, spoke in support of the extended hours. He noted that he bought all his gas from this station, and did not want to have to drive across town to buy gas when it is closed. He noted that the station had been cleaned up since a previous operator, and did not believe the current operators should be held responsible for previous operators. He believed the children would be able to cross the street safely.

Mr. Richard Nordyke spoke in opposition of the extended hours, and did not to continue to reinvent the wheel with this issue. He urged the Planning Board to resolve this issue.

Ms. Rose Ryan noted that she lived towards the back of the gas station, and was opposed to the extended hours. She expressed concern about the children's safety and the increased congestion that she believed would result from the extended hours.

Mr. Dale Blaylock noted that he was a 50-year merchant in Alameda, and former president of Greater Alameda Business Association. He recounted the background of this gas station, and noted that the applicants were not requesting extended hours for the repair business, only the gas service. He noted that because of the earlier hours, it was difficult for the owners to stay in business. He noted that owners have made an effort to be a good neighbor, and allows the church to use their parking lot on Sunday. He did not believe that selling gas only between 9 a.m. and 6 p.m. would allow them to stay in business.

Mr. Leon Zektser, 1310 Central Avenue, noted that he was one of the owners of this gas station. He noted that they had made an error in the application, and had asked to increase the hours from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m., Monday through Friday, close the repair shop on Saturday and Sunday, and not increase the hours for the repair shop. He understood the concerns about the children, and noted that the last staff report stated that there would be no increase in traffic because of the increased hours.

The public hearing was closed for Board discussion.

President Lynch noted that while the public testimony was compelling, the issue of this application was a legal issue regarding the expansion of a legal nonconforming use. With respect to the process by which the applicant wished to have the property recognized, he encouraged the applicant to pay close attention to the General Plan process and the Zoning text. Short of that, he did not see how the expansion could take place without making the three required findings.

Board member Cunningham noted that the testimony given was sometimes passionate, and echoed the comments made by President Lynch, and noted that this was more of a legal issue than a passionate issue. He could not make all the findings. He believed the use was compatible in its existing condition, but he believed that it would become incompatible by extending the hours as requested. He could not make the finding that the proposed use would not have an adverse effect on the surrounding areas. He did not believe this was the right application for this property at this time.

Vice President Cook concurred with the previous comments, and noted that she frequented this business. She noted that she has been frustrated by pulling into the pump at 8:45 to pump gas because it was not yet open, and that she was not sure she would be able to make it to the next gas station in town. She believed that the rules about nonconforming uses were quite clear, and she could not make the findings that this application would not negatively impact the other neighborhood uses. She noted that the owner was aware of the rules when he bought the property, and that the residents surrounding the use also knew the rules. She concurred with staff's recommendation in

the staff report, and did not believe there was any leeway around the requirements of this issue.

Ms. Mooney noted that there had been some clerical difficulties in assembling the packet, and noted that the resolution had not been included in the packet; staff had distributed the resolutions during the meeting. She noted that when making the findings, the Planning Board should make specific findings as they are found in the Alameda Municipal Code. She recommended that the Board members be specific when stating which findings could not be made.

Board member Kohlstrand concurred with her fellow Board members. She believed this was an unfortunate situation because she perceived there was a large population in Alameda that would like to see expanded hours for this gas station. She understood that the findings were specific. She also agreed with the speakers who were unable to use the gas station before and after work hours. She believed the Board members' hands were tied in terms of making a finding to allow the expansion of hours to occur.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that she was a regular customer of this gas station, and found it to be a very nice, well-run business. She had difficulty with some of the findings, and believed them to be both vague and subjective. With respect to the location of the use being compatible with surrounding uses, she noted that the Code prohibited the expansion of non-conforming uses. In terms of the other land uses in the area, she found it to be a commercial district in a neighborhood that included a coffee shop/café, private businesses, a children's art center, a pub and a nail salon.

With respect to the finding that the proposed use would not adversely affect other properties in the vicinity, Board member Ezzy Ashcraft recalled that one speaker stated that their property values would be lowered. She believed that property values in that area have remained strong for some time, and added that page 6-7 of the staff report identified no offending noise coming from the site. She believed the public bus that ran along Encinal Avenue generated more noise than the car doors or fueling activities. She was concerned about the safety of schoolchildren, but noted that this interaction was signalized. If the crossing time was not adequate for parents with strollers to cross the street, she believed that Public Works should extend the time of the green light across the intersection. She noted that the crossing guard stood at the corner of Encinal and Paru, near the playground. She believed the children could be instructed to walk on the one side of the street leading to the crossing guard. She added that she favored supporting local neighborhood businesses. She noted that this application had generated 13 pieces of correspondence in opposition, and 237 pieces of correspondence in support, as well as six telephone messages and the petition of support provided by Ms. Battaglia. She would like to find a way to be responsive to the community in support of what seemed to be a reasonable neighborhood business.

President Lynch agreed with Board member Ezzy Ashcraft's statements, and noted that paragraph 2 on page 4 of the staff report specifically stated under "Zoning Use Permit History" stated that the first finding could not be made legally. For a legal

nonconforming use, the findings could not be made for expansion of use and/or service. He noted that all four findings must be made because of the General Plan consistency issue to move forward. He suggested that the owner understand the process by which the zoning may be changed on this property, because he could not make the first finding.

Mr. Zektser requested that this item be continued.

In response to an inquiry by Member Ezzy Ashcraft, Mr. Thomas detailed the history of this use's previous expansion. He noted that there had been a tradeoff of auto service time for additional gas service time, with the thought that the auto repair hours had more impact than the gas service hours. He suggested hearing the applicant's thoughts on requesting a continuance.

Ms. Mooney advised that the law was clear, as governed by the Alameda Municipal Code, regarding the findings that must be made by the Planning Board. At the same time, the Board's decision was also a quasi-judicial decision, and that whether this was the expansion of a legal nonconforming use was determined by the interpretation of the factual circumstances. She concurred that the applicant should be able to state his reason for requesting a continuance.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft moved to reopen the public hearing.

Board member Kohlstrand seconded the motion, which carried by the following voice vote – 5. Absent: 2 (Mariani, McNamara).

The public hearing was reopened.

Mr. Zektser, applicant, noted that the Planning Board approved the expansion of the hours the first time in response to trading repair hours for gas service hours. He summarized previous Board actions in 2001 and 2002, and noted that they had invested a considerable amount of money for the Valero brand in order to serve the community better. He did not believe the traffic would increase, and that the children would remain safe while crossing the street.

The public hearing was closed for Board discussion.

President Lynch complimented the applicant on the manner in which he operates his business, and noted that he had clearly upgraded his service and provided excellent customer service. However, he noted that none of those items related to the first finding for him. He did not believe that the findings could be legally made, and would like the applicant to explore ways to legally accomplish that goal.

Member Ezzy Ashcraft suggested subtracting hours from the repair hours, and adding them to the gas service hours. She would support continuing this item.

Vice President Cook wished to remind the audience that the risk in use permits was that a less scrupulous owner may take a use over from a more conscientious owner.

Ms. Mooney explained the details of use permits and conditional use permits, and noted that it was customary to have conditions on a use permit.

Mr. Thomas noted that any supporter of this project must be able to argue that this would not be an expansion of use. He believed the only way that could be argued would be to equate seven hours of auto repair to 20 hours of gas sales, because gas sales have much less impact on the neighborhood than auto repair. Staff believed it could make that finding. He noted that the other option, as suggested by President Lynch, was to step back, resubmit for a rezoning to a Neighborhood Commercial district. In that case, the project would still require a use permit, but it would not be a nonconforming use any more if the rezoning was approved. He noted that the hours would run with the land.

Vice President Cook noted that a rezoning would allow her to make Finding 1, and that she had no problem making Finding 2, but still had problems with Findings 3 and 4.

Board member Cunningham believed that there must be a balance between convenience and neighborhood compatibility. He noted that a planning document can help guide that process for the neighborhood.

Board member Kohlstrand recalled the rezoning experienced by her parents' home, which resulted in three address changes. She noted that a rezoning to commercial would be consistent with the use that has remained on the site for many years, and found that more compelling than continually dealing with the nonconforming use issue.

Ms. Mooney noted that the three-year clock would start from the date of any denial, and that it would be appealable to the City Council.

Board member Cunningham moved to adopt Planning Board Resolution No. PB-07-22 to accept the staff recommendation to deny a Use Permit pursuant to Section 30-30.2 of the Alameda Municipal Code to extend the hours of operation for the Alameda Valero Gasoline Station, an existing legal nonconforming service station.

Board member Kohlstrand seconded the motion, which carried by the following voice vote – 4. No: 1 (Ezzy Ashcraft) Absent: 2 (Mariani, McNamara).

10. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS:

Mr. Thomas advised that the comment period on the Harbor Bay Village VI EIR closed on June 5, 2007, and a public hearing had been held by the Planning Board a month ago. Staff had received several requests to extend the comment period, which was extended for another month. He noted that a very large number of letters, comparable to the Target proposal, had been received. Staff and the consultant team had begun to go through the letters and scoping out the amount of additional work that would be necessary to complete to respond to the comments. Staff will meet with the applicant to establish the budget for that process.

President Lynch suggested that in staff's discussions with the applicant, that they strongly consider what they had heard so far. Mr. Thomas confirmed that the applicant would reimburse the City as they go through the process.

11. BOARD COMMUNICATIONS:

- a. Oral Status Report regarding the Oakland/Chinatown Advisory Committee (Board Member Mariani).

Board member Mariani was not in attendance to present this report.

- b. Oral Status Report regarding the Transportation subcommittee (Board Member Kohlstrand).

Board member Kohlstrand advised that the next meeting of the Pedestrian Task Force would be held June 26, 2007, from 6:00 – 8:00 p.m. She believed it would be held in one of the conference rooms on the third floor of City Hall.

In response to an inquiry by President Lynch whether the task force addressed the physical attributes of the crosswalks, Board member Kohlstrand replied that it was more at the General Plan level. She noted that it had been an unusual process, because the update to the Transportation Element was initiated by the Transportation Commission, rather than staff. She noted that Public Works took the process back under its purview, and believed the next task force meeting would examine a work scope that may be adopted for further pedestrian analysis.

Mr. Thomas advised that a Draft Transportation Element update had been prepared by the Transportation Commission, which City staff has begun to review. Staff believed it was a solid first draft, and that a series of subplans for Transportation Demand Management and the pedestrian and transit aspect of the subplans were also to be addressed. He noted that he had met with the transportation planners in the Public Works Department, and they hoped to look at Alameda in two different way: one of the established area of the Island with good pedestrian facilities, and the problematic areas of those facilities; and other large areas of Alameda undergoing complete redevelopment, such as the Northern Waterfront and Alameda Point.

President Lynch noted that he frequently talked to other residents during the course of the day, and noticed that many people loved the lighted crosswalks and wondered why they were not installed in other places around town. He noted that he was much more alert and aware during the day around the lighted crosswalks, and believed that if the City continued to encourage pedestrian and bicycle traffic, that these enhanced crosswalks would be a good addition throughout the City.

Vice President Cook noted that a survey was available on the City's website regarding pedestrian and bicycle issues, and encouraged residents to respond to that survey.

c.. Oral Status Report regarding the Alameda Climate Protection Task Force (Board Member Cunningham).

Board member Cunningham noted that a meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, June 20, 2007, which would be rescheduled to June 27, 2007. The mission of that meeting would be to review the final document of the recommendations.

Vice President Cook noted that she had information for a free public workshop offered through the UC Berkeley Extension, addressing climate issues and different techniques for greening cities. She noted that the workshop would be held on Saturday, June 23, from 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m., in San Francisco.

Mr. Thomas advised that the Oakland-Chinatown Advisory Committee would meet on Thursday, June 14, at 3:00 p.m. in Room 360 of City Hall.

12. ADJOURNMENT: 9:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew Thomas, Secretary
City Planning Board

These minutes were approved at the June 25, 2007, Planning Board meeting. This meeting was audio and video taped.